

REMARKS

Responsive to the Official Action dated November 16, 2004, the applicant adds new claims 21 through 46 to the application. Claims 1 through 20 originally asserted remain in the application. The applicant wishes to point out compelling reasons for the allowability of claims 1 through 46 now pending.

As preamble to these reasons, the applicant notes the fact that the Packer patent 6,773,135 is assigned to the same assignee which owns the present patent application. Further, applicant's representative prepared the continuation-in-part application which matured into the Packer patent and is quite familiar with the disclosure provided therein.

The Packer patent does not disclose a reflector which distributes light onto a surface of a panel, such as a billboard, in an asymmetric manner. Packer provides a lamp and a single reflector which only provide a symmetric distribution. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 is inappropriate. Please also note that the Examiner on page 2 of the Action lumps claim 10 with claim 1. Claim 10 does not use the term "asymmetric". Perhaps the Examiner is confused. Claim 10 recites a main reflector and a secondary reflector, as do other claims. Packer does not disclose two reflectors, a main reflector and a secondary reflector with the secondary reflector being positioned behind the lamp. The Examiner misinterprets Figure 6b. Only a single reflector is disclosed by Packer, the reflector in certain embodiments being slightly bent though forming an essentially continuous curvilinear surface. The Packer structure thus differs from the structure recited in any of the claims herein asserted.

Particular note is made of claims 5 and 6 inter alia which respectively recite a parabolic contour for the main reflector and an elliptical contour for the secondary reflector.

Packer makes no such disclosure. Relative to claim 9 inter alia, Packer does not disclose disposition of the lamp in proximity to a side panel within a luminaire.

Claims 1 through 20 are believed to be clearly allowable over Packer considered under 35 USC 102(b) or in view of Packer and Barthel under 35 USC 103(a) relative to claim 6 since both references fail to disclose that structure pointed out hereinabove.

New independent claim 21 recites a reflector having a main reflector and a secondary reflector. Claims 22 through 29 depend from claim 21. Neither Packer nor Barthel disclose such structure.

New independent claim 30 recites subject matter similar to that of previously allowable claim 12 with the exception of a lack of limitation of lamp orientation. Claim 30 as well as claims 31 through 38 depending therefrom are believed allowable.

New independent claim 39 places in independent form the subject matter of claim 12 as originally asserted, claim 39 being in condition for allowance as would be claims 40 through 45 depending therefrom. Dependent claims 49 through 45 are essentially identical to originally asserted claims 13 through 17 which were indicated as allowable in the Action.

New independent claim 46 recites the subject matter essentially asserted in originally asserted claim 18, this subject matter being clearly allowable for the reasons given hereinabove.

Claim 20 has been allowed.

For the reasons given herein, the applicant believes that claims 1 through 46 should be allowed. Favorable consideration of the application as amended is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Kenneth E. Darnell
Kenneth E. Darnell
Reg. No. 26541

2010 West 7th Street
Coffeyville, Kansas 67337

620 251-1947